DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 048 581 AL 002 768

AUTHOR Andersson, Theodore
TITLE Bilingual Education: The American Experience.
PUB DATE Mar 71
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education Conference on Bilingual Education, Toronto, Canada, March 13, 1971

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Acculturation, Biculturalism, *Bilingual Education, *Bilingual Schools, *Educational Legislation, *English (Second Language), French, German, History, Language Planning, Spanish
IDENTIFIERS *Bilingual Education Act, Canada, United States

ABSTRACT

The United States experience with bilingual schools falls into two periods: from 1840-1920 and from 1963 to the present. Bilingual schooling may be said to have originated in Cincinnati in 1840, where a large minority of the population was German-speaking. During this first period, perhaps a million American children received a part of their instruction in German as well as in English. Despite the extent and historical importance of this early bilingual schooling, however, it failed to provide an authoritative curriculum model for bilingual education. The bilingual program, often only a language program, was rarely integrated into either the philosophy or the practice of the school or society. Bilingual schooling disappeared from the U.S. scene from the time of World War I until 1963, when the Dade County bilingual program was initiated in Miami, Florida. A Ford Foundation grant provided for instruction in both English and Spanish for Spanish- and English-speaking children. Before the enactment of the Bilingual Education Act in 1968, the number of federally supported bilingual programs was probably less than 100; at present writing, there are 131 programs supported by federal grants. (In addition to discussing the contributions of various educators and linguists, the author includes an extensive bibliography of recent and forthcoming works.) (AMM)

ED048581

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BILINGUAL EDUCATION: THE AMERICAN EXPERIENCE[⊠]

Theodore Andersson, Resource Specialist

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory - Austin, Texas
March 1971

Introduction.

Canada and the United States are both wrestling with problems of bilingual education and both are finding unsuspected obstacles to their solution. That Canadian educators should wish to include the United States experience in their study is, I think, a tribute more to them than to us. A close look at the experiences on both sides of the border is likely to reveal that we have more to learn from you than you from us. The presence in Quebec of the International Center of Research on Bilingualism is a deserved recognition that Canada is in the forefront of bilingual research. The study being published in many volumes by the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, though it cannot possibly satisfy all colors of opinion, seems to an outsider like a model of objectivity and constructiveness. The founding in 1965 of OISE and the inclusion of Bilingual Education among the projects of its Modern Language Center are further evidence of the seriousness with which Canadians are seeking to solve basic problems through educational research. Such educational experiments as those being conducted in Welland, in the French School in Toronto, in St. Lambert, and the many others which have been reported in this

---

[⊠]Paper presented at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education Conference on Bilingual Education, Toronto, March 13, 1971.

AL 002 768

Conference deserve high commendation. Whether or not there are also some modest lessons to be learned from our experience in the United States will have to be left to Canadian educators to determine. I shall merely sketch our experiences and try to point some of the directions in which we seem to be going.

The Period from 1840 to 1920.

The United States experience with bilingual schools falls into two distinct periods, the first from 1840 to 1920 and the second beginning in 1963. A form of bilingual schooling may be said to have originated in Cincinnati in 1840. Cincinnati was one of the many communities in which the majority or a large minority of the population was German-speaking. German immigrants, arriving in waves during the latter decades of the 19th century, often found our common schools inferior to those they had known in Germany. As a result they established private and parochial German schools, which for some decades competed successfully with the public schools despite the fact that German parents had to pay tuition and school taxes. However, it became a matter of increasing concern to native-born Americans that speakers of other languages be assimilated to our speech and way of life. In order to draw German children into the American schools, the State of Ohio passed a law in 1840 that made it "the duty of the Board of Trustees and Visitors of common schools to provide a number of German schools under some duly qualified teachers for the instruction of such youth as desire to learn the German language or the German and English languages together." In this same year Cincinnati introduced German instruction in the grades as an optional subject and may thus be credited with having initiated bilingual schooling in the United States.

We have fragmentary data on similar bilingual programs in about a dozen other communities, including several of our largest cities, which permit us to conjecture that during this period at least a million American children received a part of their instruction in German as well as in English. This experience left an indelible mark on some individuals. In the latest number of The Modern Language Journal, for example, we read the reminiscences of Robert Roeming, the former editor of this Journal, who received some of his early schooling in German in Milwaukee.[1] To this day, in spite of the fact that he has made a career of French and is a respected scholar in modern French literature, he feels himself to be more authentically bilingual in German and English than in French and English.

Despite the extent and historical importance of this early bilingual schooling, which has been most completely described in various works by Heinz Kloss,[2] it failed to provide an authoritative curriculum model for bilingual education. The truth is that not a single community could boast an effective bilingual program that continued over a long period of time and that was adequately supported by the population it served.[3] We have an excellent account of one program, that of Indianapolis, which lasted 50 years from its inception in 1869 until its demise in 1919--along with that of all German instruction in elementary schools and almost all in secondary schools--as a result of the World War I hysteria. Frances Ellis of Indiana University has described the vicissitudes of the Indianapolis program as it fluctuated in quality and support.[4] It enjoyed greatest success during those periods when it was blessed with an able program supervisor who had the authority to select competent teachers. But more often than not it languished--as did programs in other cities.

In attempting a balance-sheet for this early period of bilingual education we must recognize many negative items, which more than counterbalance the occasional successes. All too often the bilingual program rested on the political pressure of the German element in a community instead of reflecting a shared conviction by English-speaking and German-speaking alike that all children stood to benefit from instruction in two languages. Frequently the English-speaking citizens were merely tolerant, not really convinced of the educational benefits of two languages, and then only if the cost remained moderate. The school board and the school administrators endured a program as long as an efficient supervisor relieved them of the necessity of thinking about it. In a word, the bilingual program--often only a language program--was rarely integrated into either the philosophy or the practice of the school or of society. There was no clear resolution of the question of melting-pot versus cultural pluralism. Culture was understood in its elitist sense: involving knowledge of grammar, correctness in language usage, a somewhat exclusive emphasis on literature and the arts. Superior quality was rarely achieved in teaching, in teacher training, in curriculum planning, in evaluation, or in community involvement.

The Interval from 1920 to 1963.

Bilingual schooling--in the sense of instruction in and through two languages--disappeared from the United States scene between 1920 and 1963. The 20's, 30's, and 40's were a low period of foreign languages in general, which almost disappeared from the elementary-school curriculum, succumbing to the increased prestige of the social studies. Only an occasional FLES (Foreign Language in the Elementary School) program sprang up, such as the French program created by

Émile B. de Sauzé in Cleveland in 1922. Not until 1952 did language education begin to regain lost ground, thanks to the stirring challenge of U.S. Commissioner of Education Earl J. McGrath.[5]

How far the thinking of the time was from that of the present is evident from the fact that Commissioner McGrath proposed that languages be introduced, on a purely voluntary basis, in the 4th and 5th grades--on the analogy of European schools--and that they be taught for only 10 - 20 minutes a day. Even so, FLES grew rapidly in popularity, matching the strides being made in secondary schools and colleges (in the American sense) under the impetus of the Foreign Language Program of the Modern Language Association. Significant pedagogical advances were made, partly on the model of the Army Specialized Training Program. William Riley Parker's insistence on relating the learning of foreign languages to the national interest,[6] the theoretical and practical contributions of linguistic scientists, and the gradual forming of a collective consciousness by language teachers prepared the way for the National Defense Education Act of 1958, designed to help remedy some of the defects in our educational system which had been dramatized by World War II. Thanks to the preparatory work of William Parker, foreign languages were joined with science and mathematics and received significant financial support from the federal government.

The result of these circumstances was a partial recovery for the teaching of foreign languages, but still there was no suggestion of bilingual education until 1963.

The Period from 1963 to 1968.

The contemporary period of bilingual schooling in the U.S. was inaugurated in the Coral Way Elementary School, Dade County, Miami, Florida. Here, in 1963, was initiated in grades 1, 2, and 3 a real

bilingual program, supported by a grant from the Ford Foundation. The school population was about equally divided between English speakers and Spanish-speaking Cuban children. Parents were offered a choice between the traditional all-English program and a bilingual program in which about half of the teaching would be done in Spanish by experienced Cuban teachers. All the English-speaking parents and all but a sprinkling of the Cuban parents opted for the bilingual program, and by the end of the first year the preference for the bilingual program was so nearly unanimous that it was not necessary the second year to continue the all-English curriculum.

During half of the school day subjects are taught in the pupils' native language--in Spanish to Spanish-speaking children by Cuban teachers and in English to English-speaking children by native American teachers. During the other half of the school day, the concepts which have been introduced in the native language are reinforced in the pupils' second language. Once the children have acquired adequate control of the second language, concepts are introduced in the native language of the teacher regardless of the native language of the student. The children are mixed on the playground and at lunch, in music and art, and are free to speak in either language.[7]

In 1968 Mabel Wilson Richardson reported on an evaluation of this program:[8]

"The bilingual program of study was relatively as effective for both English and Spanish-speaking subjects as the regular curriculum in achieving progress in the language arts and in arithmetic. In other words, the experimental subjects were not handicapped in academic achievement in English by studying and learning through a second language for approximately half of each school day.

"It must be noted here that, in addition to performing as well as the control groups in the regular curriculum, the English-speaking pupils were learning a second language and the Spanish-speaking pupils were learning to read and write their native language."

In 1964 the United Consolidated Independent School District in Webb County, outside of Laredo, Texas, initiated a locally supported bilingual program in all the first-grade classes of the Nye Elementary School, and in 1966 extended the program to the other two schools of this sparsely populated district, the area of which equals that of the State of Delaware. As in Dade County, the program is completely and equally bilingual but uses only bilingual teachers, who teach all subjects in both languages, moving back and forth from one language to the other but without direct translation. The program is not experimentally designed, largely because everyone connected with it--school board, administrators, teachers, and parents--is so convinced of the superiority of this type of program over the traditional monolingual system that they do not wish to sacrifice children to a control group. A comparison of learning in mathematics before and after the start of the program, conducted by Bertha Alicia Gámez Treviño,[9] revealed that both English-speaking and Spanish-speaking children learned mathematics better bilingually (through Spanish and English) than monolingually (through English alone).

A second Texas program was begun in 1964, in the San Antonio Independent School District, under the direction of Thomas D. Horn of the University of Texas at Austin. Originally designed as a reading readiness program in English, this project had one stream of Mexican-American children who were taught self-concept and science concepts orally in Spanish, each for about 30 minutes a day. In 1967 the

bilingual approach was given increased emphasis in a new start in grades one and two. Self-concept, mathematics, science, and social studies were taught in Spanish in selected classes for as much as 80 minutes a day. The outcome fell short of the ideal, however, for it was difficult to find teachers who were both convinced of the value of Spanish as a medium of instruction and able to teach this varied subject matter in Spanish. Great efforts have gone into evaluating the experiment, but results have not been gratifying. Not even administrative favor and the financial support of two successive Bilingual Education Act grants have been able to counterbalance the shortage of adequately prepared teachers and the indifference of parents and general public.

In the two or three years prior to the passage of the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 about a dozen locally supported bilingual programs were initiated in Texas--in Del Rio, Del Valle, Edinburg, La Joya, Laredo, McAllen, Mission, the Edgewood and Harlandale Districts of San Antonio, and Zapata--and perhaps an equal number in the other Southwestern states--in Las Cruces, Pecos, and Silver City, New Mexico; in Fort Defiance, Kayenta, Rock Point, Rough Rock, and Tucson, Arizona; in Calexico, Marysville, and Stockton, California; among others. In these, one may find examples of outstanding individual teaching, of solid support by individual administrators, of occasional public interest or political pressure, but it is rare indeed to find in any single program all of the conditions needed for success. And efforts to evaluate results have been only desultory. It seems doubtful therefore that bilingual schooling, however sound it may be in theory, could have prospered without the federal support provided through the Bilingual Education Act of 1968. Just as U.S. Commissioner of Education

Earl J. McGrath had thrown his influence behind the incipient FLES movement in 1952, so Senator Ralph W. Yarborough of Texas threw his crusading spirit behind bilingual education and was able to bring about the triumphant passage of the Bilingual Education Act--with what effect we shall see.

The Bilingual Education Act of 1968.

On January 17, 1967, a historic bill (S. 428) was introduced in the Senate of the United States by the senior senator from Texas together with seven other senators as co-sponsors. This, the first bilingual education bill of this scope ever to be introduced in the Congress of the United States, recognized and aimed to redress the traditional miseducation of children whose home language is other than English. On January 2, 1968, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed into law the Bilingual Education Act, with the words, "Thousands of children of Latin descent, young Indians, and others will get a better start--a better chance--in school.... What this law means, is that we are now giving every child in America a better chance to touch his outermost limits--to reach the farthest edge of his talents and his dreams. We have begun a campaign to unlock the full potential of every boy and girl--regardless of his race or his region or his father's income."[10]

How can one explain that this bill, which only five years earlier would have been inconceivable, should now win the overwhelming approval of Congress? What in historical perspective seems like a sudden about-face in our educational policy was of course the result of a lucky confluence of social, economic, and political forces and of extensive research. Let us consider the social context and the research which help explain the Bilingual Education Act, before considering its main features.

The Social Context.

As noted earlier, World War II dramatized the inability of our armed forces to communicate with our Allies or others in any language but English. Made suddenly aware of the dangers represented by such deficiencies, our government quickly organized the Army Specialized Training Program for the purpose of teaching selected service men by the most intensive methods how to understand and speak other languages. The irony of teaching foreign languages to adults, expensively and inefficiently, while missing the opportunity to maintain and cultivate the linguistic competence which millions of our American children acquire by the accident of birth was not lost on such educators as William R. Parker and Bruce Gaarder. At the same time large numbers of our service men who had personally experienced linguistic shortcomings returned home from Europe and Asia convinced that our schools should do something to repair such deficiency, for their children at least.

Another dramatic impact on our national thinking was made by Sputnik, reminding us that in the field of science too we were far from self-sufficient. We have the Russians as much as anyone to thank for the National Defense Education Act--a forerunner of the Bilingual Education Act--with its tremendous support of education, not only in science and mathematics but also in foreign languages.

Following our Supreme Court's decision of 1954 to desegregate education, our minority groups and those sympathizing with them became more and more active. We became increasingly conscious of the fact that not only segregation but also poverty and linguistic deficiency played an important role in our educational shortcomings. The dialects of English spoken by Blacks were studied and compared with

standard English. Special techniques were developed for the teaching of English as a second dialect and, in the case of non-English speakers, as a second language.

"Imagine the situation," writes Senator Yarborough, "that confronts a certain youngster from my part of the country. A youngster spends his formative years in the warm, friendly environment of his family and friends--an environment in which Spanish is spoken. At the age of 5 or 6 he is taken to school. What a profound shock he encounters the first day there, when he is made to know in no uncertain terms that he may speak no Spanish at school. He must speak English, a language which he scarcely knows, both in the classroom and on the playground. If he is caught speaking Spanish, he will be punished."[11]

The close correlation between inability in English and educational deficiency was revealed with special vividness by a Texas Education Agency Report of 1957,[12] which showed that the average Spanish-surnamed Texan child was at that time spending three years in the first grade and was dropping out of school before reaching the fifth grade (4.7). The per capita income of "Anglos" in Texas in 1959 was $4,137, that of Spanish-surnamed Texans $2,029.[13]

As the public conscience has gradually become sensitive to the educational predicament of our poor and our Blacks, so have we begun to understand the special disadvantage of our Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, Portuguese, Chinese, American Indians, Eskimos, and other ethnic groups. Certain educational leaders and researchers have played an important role in educating public opinion.

Researchers and Opinion Molders.

Public concern for bilingual education has also been partly stimulated and partly directed by numerous investigators and promoters,

of whom I shall cite only a few.

Heinz Kloss, who has been mentioned as a close observer of the early period of bilingual education in the United States, began his publication on this subject in 1937 and is still active in his research.[2]

Werner F. Leopold is the author of a classic four-volume study of the bilingualism of an individual child, his daughter, as well as the writer of other studies.[14]

Einar Haugen's investigation also extends over several decades, having begun in 1938 and continuing until the present. Among his numerous studies[15] are a two-volume work on The Norwegian Language in America: A Study in Bilingual Behavior, a study of Bilingualism in the Americas: A Bibliography and Research Guide, and a 139-page article in press on "Bilingualism, Language Contacts, and Immigrant Languages in the United States: A Research Report, 1956-1970."

Another basic study of an ethnic group in America is Leonard Covello's The Social Background of the Italo-American School Child (1967).[16]

Herschel T. Manuel's[17] Spanish-Speaking Children in the Southwest; Thomas B. Carter's[18] Mexican-Americans in School; and the study by Leo Grebler,[19] Joan W. Moore, and Ralph C. Guzmán entitled The Mexican-American People are three solid studies of our most numerous non-English speaking group. Fundamental research has also been done by Uriel Weinreich,[20] Susan Ervin-Tripp,[21] Dell Hymes,[22] Nancy Modiano,[23] John Gumperz,[24] and Muriel Saville and Rudolph Troike.[25]

Let me next mention three names that belong perhaps more in the promotional category than in pure research. I have already mentioned the important role played by Earl J. McGrath, who attended an

international conference on education in Beirut in 1952 and observed with chagrin that in contrast with other delegates not one of the five American Ph.D.s was able to communicate, formally or informally, with other delegates in any language but English. Returning, he threw his full influence as U.S. Commissioner of Education behind the idea of introducing foreign languages into the elementary-school curriculum. Perhaps even more influential was William R. Parker, architect and first director of the Foreign Language Program of the Modern Language Association and author of The National Interest and Foreign Languages. And promoter par excellence of bilingual education, Senator Ralph W. Yarborough[26] of Texas, spoke and wrote eloquently on the subject. In addition, as Chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Bilingual Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the United States Senate, he arranged numerous hearings on his proposed bilingual education bill. The testimony of well over a hundred witnesses has been recorded in two volumes, which are a mine of special information and a reflection of the ground swell in favor of bilingual education.

The promotional work and research of various organizations should also be mentioned. The Southwest Council of Foreign Language Teachers, which later changed its name to the Southwest Council on Bilingual Education, began holding meetings in 1964 and has issued reports on various aspects of bilingual education ever since 1965.[27] The National Education Association, throwing the enormous influence of its huge membership behind bilingual education, organized in 1966 a conference on this subject and published reports.[28] The Texas Education Agency[29]--and undoubtedly several other state departments as well--has organized conferences on behalf of bilingual education, and the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory[30] sponsored in 1968-69 a

comprehensive study of bilingual schooling in the United States.

The need for informational and promotional work has also been recognized on the federal level by the establishment in 1967 of the Mexican-American Affairs Unit in the U.S. Office of Education with Armando Rodríguez as its first chief. In 1970 the name and scope of this unit was changed, and Armando Rodríguez was made Director of a new Office for Spanish Speaking American Affairs. In 1967 also, the Inter-Agency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs was established to help solve Mexican-American problems and to bring Federal programs to the attention of Mexican-Americans. In 1969 the name of this Committee was changed to Cabinet Committee on Opportunity for the Spanish-Speaking, Henry A. Quevedo, Director, and the responsibility correspondingly enlarged.

I have purposely saved for the end mention of the names of two men who combine the gifts of scholarship and promotion. They have frequently collaborated. When Bruce Gaarder was director of Language Research in the U.S. Office of Education, Joshua A. Fishman carried out brilliantly one of the most important pieces of research under this program. Fishman's Language Loyalty in the United States forms a solid base for much of the investigation and experimentation which has followed. His studies[31] are too numerous to detail here but constitute essential reading for the serious student of bilingual education in the United States.

From his vantage point in the U.S. Office of Education Bruce Gaarder has issued a series of research papers[32] and made a number of persuasive public appeals in favor of bilingual education. He and Fishman collaborated on a particularly good statement of the issues involved, at the Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages in 1965.

Provisions of the Act and of the Project Manual.

What then are the main provisions of the Bilingual Education Act[33] and of the Manual for Project Applicants and Grantees?[34] The Act begins with a Declaration of Policy: "In recognition of the special educational needs of the large numbers of children of limited English-speaking ability in the United States, Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance to local educational agencies to develop and carry out new and imaginative elementary and secondary school programs designed to meet these special educational needs. For the purposes of this title, 'children of limited English-speaking ability' means children who come from environments where the dominant language is other than English."

This basic statement of purpose forms a natural bone of contention between the assimilationists and the linguistic and cultural pluralists. The Manual elaborates on the Declaration of Policy in carefully guarded terms: "It is intended that children participating in this program will develop greater competence in English, become more proficient in their dominant language, and profit from increased educational opportunity. Though the Title VII, ESEA program affirms the primary importance of English, it also recognizes that the use of the children's mother tongue in school can have a beneficial effect upon their education. Instructional use of the mother tongue can help to prevent retardation in school performance until sufficient command of English is attained. Moreover, the development of literacy in the mother tongue as well as in English should result in more broadly educated adults."

The Act does not explicitly define bilingual education, but the Manual does: "Bilingual education is the use of two languages, one of

which is English, as mediums of instruction for the same pupil population in a well-organized program which encompasses part or all of the curriculum and includes the study of the history and culture associated with the mother tongue. A complete program develops and maintains the children's self-esteem and a legitimate pride in both cultures."

Programs under the Bilingual Education Act are intended primarily for children of limited English-speaking ability between the ages of 3 and 18. Public schools eligible to receive grants are expected also to make the benefits of the program available to similar children in private or parochial schools. And English-speaking children are expected to have an opportunity to learn the non-English mother tongue of their classmates.

The bilingual programs suggested in the Act and in the Manual are comprehensive. They may include bilingual programs of various designs, the development and dissemination of special instructional materials, early childhood educational programs, adult education, training programs designed for teachers and other, ancillary education personnel.

Another controversial feature of the Act is the poverty clause, which tends to restrict grants to school districts "having a high concentration of such children from families (A) with incomes below $3,000 per year, or (B) receiving payments under a program of aid to families with dependent children under a State plan approved under Title IV of the Social Security Act, ..."

For the support of programs under the Bilingual Education Act the following sums have been authorized, but <u>not appropriated</u>: for fiscal year 1968, $15,000,000; for fiscal year 1969, $30,000,000; for

fiscal year 1970, $40,000,000; for fiscal year 1971, $80,000,000; for fiscal year 1972, $100,000,000; and for fiscal year 1973, $135,000,000. Despite the authorization, there was no appropriation voted for FY 1968 or FY 1969. For FY 1970 a compromise appropriation of $7,500,000 was voted, and for FY 1971 the appropriation voted was $25,000,000, which was reduced by President Nixon to $21,250,000.

Another significant feature, not of the Act but of the Manual, is the inclusion of a section on Accountability for Results. With the acute limitation of available funds, officials[35] in the U.S. Office of Education felt that increasing care had to be exercised to assure the best return on expenditures. Noting that much educational research in the past had resulted in either unmeasured or insignificant results, it was decided to select the Bilingual Education Act for a new type of evaluative procedure. This procedure is described in the Manual in the following terms:

"Every local educational agency accepting a grant under Title VII will be held responsible for the achievement of specific objectives using certain procedures during a specified period of time, and for the cost effectiveness of the instructional and management procedures involved in the project. Major requirements for accountability include the following:

"1. Objectives must be stated in terms of desired student performance. Obviously, a school system cannot determine the extent to which its objectives have been achieved unless its goals, embodied in the objectives, are clearly defined and measurable.

"2. A school system must recognize its own capabilities and deficiencies and must seek to utilize appropriate technical assistance in an effort to develop and operate an effective program.

"3. All projects must provide for an independent educational accomplishment audit of the project, to apprise school officials of the validity of their own evaluative processes and data."

Programs Funded for FY 1970 and FY 1971.

As noted earlier, no federal funds were appropriated for support of bilingual programs until FY 1970. There was, however, a small number of locally supported bilingual programs already in operation. As recorded in our monograph on Bilingual Schooling in the United States, we have identified 56 such programs, 49 of which were in pre-primary or elementary grades, 4 in secondary grades, and 3 in colleges. About the same time Vera P. John and Vivian Horner surveyed early childhood bilingual programs in Spanish and American Indian languages.[36] Comparing the two lists and allowing for some programs which may have been overlooked, we can conjecture that before the beginning of federal support bilingual programs did not in all likelihood exceed the number of 100 in the entire country.

With the signing into law of the Bilingual Education bill there was naturally a great increase of interest and activity. From some 315 proposals received the Bilingual Programs staff of the U.S. Office of Education, aided by a team of proposal readers, selected a total of 76 programs for funding in 70 different cities. Of these, 54 were in elementary schools only, 8 in secondary schools only and 14 in both. The average cost of a project for one year was $98,684. Of the 76 programs, 68 involved Spanish, 58 of these programs benefiting Mexican-Americans, 7 Puerto Ricans, 2 Puerto Ricans and one other language group, 2 mixed Spanish-speaking groups, one Spanish and Sioux, one Spanish and Pomo, one Spanish and Keresan and Navajo, and one Spanish and Chinese. There were 2 programs in Portuguese, 2 in Cherokee, and

one each in French, Japanese, Navajo (plus the one noted above), and one in Chinese (Cantonese, plus the one noted above).

Applications for grants in FY 1971 declined from 315 to 195. Of these, 59 new programs were selected for funding. Of the 76 grants made the previous year, 72 were adjudged worthy of continuation grants. We thus have at the present time 131 bilingual programs supported by grants under the Bilingual Education Act. These programs are located in 30 states and Guam. Forty-eight are in California, 32 in Texas, 11 in New Mexico, 8 each in Arizona and New York. Sixteen languages are involved: 5 projects in French, 5 in Navajo, 3 in Portuguese, 2 in Cherokee and Chinese, one each in Keresan, Pomo, Japanese, Eskimo, Ute, Crow, Choctaw, Russian, and Chamorro, and the remainder--105--in Spanish. Some projects serve more than one language group.

We may safely assume that in some cases, at least, local educational agencies welcomed this federal support as an opportunity to remedy defects of which they had long been aware. In fact, 16 of the 76 programs were continuations or transformations of earlier existing programs. However, given the widespread earlier opposition to the principle of language maintenance, much of which still persists, one cannot avoid the suspicion that many local educational agencies were not motivated altogether by educational idealism.

Assessments.

The most detailed evaluation of the first 76 federally funded programs is that of Gaarder,[37] who studied critically the plans of operation of these program proposals as well as returns from a questionnaire sent to the project directors. Gaarder is careful to point out that he did not have the benefit of direct observation of programs in action and that his assessment is based on only the first

half year of the five years that are projected for these programs. He is also conscious of the fact that it takes several years to develop language competency in children. Nevertheless his general conclusion is that "in the large majority of these programs there is such inadequate attention--time, resources, and understanding--to the other tongue, as compared to the attention paid to English that, on the whole, the concept of bilingual education represented by these plans of operation seems to be something less than the legislation and its advocates intended." One reason for this, according to Gaarder, is that "the Congress couched its ... legislation in support of dual-language public schooling in terms that permit both the ethnocentrists and the cultural pluralists to see what they want to see in the Act." Gaarder does not deny that planners are "quite within their rights" to propose "the use of the child's mother tongue for purposes of instruction as a 'bridge' to English," but to Gaarder the bridge seems usually to be a one-way affair.

Another weakness that Gaarder discovers from reading the plans of operation is that most of the teachers are not prepared for bilingual schooling, that "to a large extent the projects expect to depend on the teaching services of aides, sometimes called para-professionals, 'bilingual' individuals usually drawn from the community, rarely required to be literate in the non-English tongue, and paid disproportionately low wages." Gaarder remarks pointedly that "the merely bilingual person is the product of the very kind of schooling which bilingual education aims to correct."

Gaarder notes still another difficulty with respect to the representation of the two cultures involved in bilingual programs. "Teachers are expected to represent and present authentically, fully,

fairly, two cultures.... Does not biculturalism--a word which appears repeatedly in the projects' aims--imply double perspective, not the perspective of two eyes, but of two pairs of eyes?"

Referring to the lack of community support for bilingual education, Gaarder asks, "Is it really possible to make a child vigorously literate in his mother tongue if that vigor and literacy are not somehow matched in public places and in the homes? Do children really read eagerly and widely if their parents read reluctantly and seldom?"

And Gaarder concludes by declaring that "if bilingual schooling, the noblest innovation in American education, is to succeed, it must have close, objective, encouraging attention from all sides. The projects need, above all else, formative evaluation by knowledgeable outside observers who--with the gentle pressure of the Office of Education's authority and responsibility to continue each grant only so long as the work is performed satisfactorily--can help each project to become a model of its kind. Without radical strengthening some could probably never become models. They should either be strengthened or abandoned."

For another assessment of these same programs we are indebted to Rolf Kjolseth, a sociologist at the University of California, Davis.[38] Kjolseth posits two ideal typical bilingual education programs: "One, the Assimilation model, embodies an optimal selection of those program characteristics which tend to promote ethnic language shift. The other, the Pluralist model, comprises an optimal structure for promoting ethnic language maintenance." His analysis "reveals that currently most bilingual education programs--quite contrary to the usual statements of program goals--highly approximate the Assimilation model. This means that the structure of 'typical' existing programs in the

area of these language maintenance efforts can be expected to foster the accelerated demise of the ethnic mother tongue."

Let me conclude this section on the evaluation of current bilingual programs by quoting Joshua Fishman and his collaborator John Lovas,[39] who find that "bilingual education in the United States currently suffers from three serious lacks: a lack of funds (Title VII is pitifully starved), a lack of personnel (there is almost no optimally trained personnel in this field), and a lack of evaluative programs (curricula, material, methods)." Despite this, Fishman claims not to be discouraged. "We live in an age of miracles. If we have reached the stage where even teachers of English as a Second Language are becoming genuinely interested in bilingual education, then, truly, the remaining hurdles should soon fall away and the millenium arrive in our own days!"

In considering bilingual programs in the United States as a whole Fishman is conscious of Mackey's comprehensive typology[40] but adopts a four-item typology of his own which he considers to reflect the present situation.

Type I, Transitional Bilingualism, is one in which the non-English language "is used in the early grades only to the extent necessary to permit children to 'adjust to school' and/or to 'master subject matter,' until their skill in English is developed to the point that it can be used as the medium of instruction." Type II, Monoliterate Bilingualism, admits of "goals of development in both languages for aural-oral skills, but do not concern themselves with literacy skills in the mother tongue." Type III, Partial Bilingualism, "seeks fluency and literacy in both languages, but literacy in the mother tongue is restricted to certain subject matter, most generally

that related to the ethnic group and its cultural heritage." Type IV, Full Bilingualism, is the kind of program in which "students are to develop all skills in both languages in all domains. Typically, both languages are used as media of instruction for all subjects (except in teaching the languages themselves). Clearly this program is directed at language maintenance and development of the minority language." Although Fishman numbers himself "among those who value the maintenance and development of cultural and linguistic diversity in the United States," he, like Gaarder and Kjolseth, doubts that "most of the existing and proposed bilingual education programs have [this] as their goal." Fishman goes on to declare that even when planners of bilingual programs do have such goals in view they "still do not know how to collect the societal data we need for enlightened decision making in the field of bilingual education." Thus, for example, Fishman points out that "the school may attempt a program aimed at language maintenance ... in a community actually in the process of language shift.... Conversely, the school may attempt a program aimed at language shift ... for a community determined to maintain its own language in many (or all) social domains.... Even if the school program and community objectives are fortuitously congruent, the school program may not take account of important characteristics of the speech community, e.g., (a) the existence of one or more non-standard varieties (in one or more languages) whose school appropriateness as a medium or as a subject must be ascertained from the speech community itself; (b) differential use of these varieties by members of the speech community from one societal domain to another and from one speech network to another."

The principal conclusions drawn by Fishman and Lovas in their evaluative article are the following:

"We are just overcoming the deceptive and self-deluding view that teaching English as a second language is, in itself, all there is to bilingual education."

"We are just beginning to realize that public schools should belong to parents, to pupils, to communities."

"We may soon arrive at the disturbing conclusion that it is not necessarily treasonous for pupils, teachers, parents, and principals to speak to each other in languages other than English, ..."

"We still do not realize that the need for bilingual education must not be viewed as merely a disease of the poor and the disadvantaged."

But the main conclusion of Fishman and Lovas in their article is that planners of Bilingual education need much greater sociological sophistication than they have so far displayed.

Conclusion.

What is the present state of affairs? Albar Peña, Director of the Bilingual Education Programs Branch in the U.S. Office of Education, reports that only 150 proposals have been received for FY '72, as compared with 315 in FY '70 and 195 in FY '71. In part this is a reflection of the economic recession in which we find ourselves, but we must also remember the limitations represented by the Bilingual Education Act itself. It is designed to meet "the special educational needs ... of children of limited English-speaking ability" in school districts "having a high concentration of such children from families ... with incomes below $3,000 per year...." In view of these restrictions the U.S. Office of Education staff has tried especially to

encourage exemplary demonstration programs, but so far without much success.

The obstacles to success are indeed formidable. Perhaps the greatest of these is the doubt in many communities that the maintenance of non-English languages is desirable. It has not yet been demonstrated, however plausible it seems, that a Mexican-American child can become literate in English best by first becoming literate in Spanish. To resolve this doubt in the public mind we shall need to mobilize all available resources behind a few really convincing demonstrations.

Even in a community which is determined to maintain and cultivate a non-English tongue and which has resolved the questions of language domains and standards, as Fishman urges us to do, there still remain great difficulties. The proper meshing of instruction of the non-English language as a first language and as a second language is not simple. The teaching of reading and writing as soon as the children are ready, first in the mother tongue and then in the second language, requires sensitiveness and skill. And teachers have great difficulty too in conceiving of languages as mediums of instruction and not just as subjects. To be successful, a bilingual teacher needs to be a kind of Leonardo da Vinci or else must become a member of a team of teachers in order to stay ahead of the children in all subjects of the curriculum.

Still another massive obstacle is the education of bilingual teachers. Teacher-preparing institutions are only beginning to become aware that new and better programs are urgently needed to educate qualified teachers in the numbers required.

The achievement of truly exemplary programs will not be easy.

As we have seen, many communities are by no means convinced of the desirability of linguistic and cultural pluralism. Even those that are, are handicapped by the lack of adequately qualified teachers and other personnel, by the shortage of adequate materials, by inadequate evaluation methods, and by a lack of collaboration between school and community. Most serious of all is the critical observation of Fishman that present program planners seem unaware of the importance of social data in the planning of their programs.

I venture, in conclusion, to predict that our bilingual education program in the United States will succeed only if it achieves quality, quality such as has never before been attained. If we fail to achieve this new level of workmanship, we may expect this exhilarating new trend in our schools to languish and die as have so many other hopeful educational ideas in the past.

References

1. Roeming, Robert F. "Bilingualism and the National Interest," The Modern Language Journal, Vol. LV, No. 2 (February 1971), pp. 73-81.

2. Kloss, Heinz. Um die Einigung des Deutschamerikanertums: Die Geschichte einer unvollendeten Volksgruppe. Berlin: Volk und Reich Verlag, 1937.

_____. "Über die mittelbare kartographische Erfassung der jüngerer deutschen Volkinseln in den Vereinigten Staaten." Deutsches Archiv für Landes und Volksforschung, Vol. III (1939), pp. 453-474.

_____. Das Volksgruppenrecht in den Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika. Essen, Germany: Essener Verlagsanstalt, 1940 (Part I) and 1942 (Part II).

_____. "Die deutschamerikanische Schule." Jahrbuch für Amerikastudien (Heidelberg), Vol. II (1962), pp. 141-175.

_____. Das Nationalitätenrecht der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika. Vienna, Austria: Braumüller, 1963.

_____. "Types of Multilingual Communities: A Discussion of Ten Variables." Sociological Inquiry, Vol. XXXVI, No. 2 (Spring 1966), pp. 135-145.

_____. FLES: Zum Problem des Fremdsprachenunterrichts an Grundschulen Amerikas und Europas. Bad Godesberg: Verlag Wissenschaftliches Archiv, 1967.

_____. "Bilingualism and Nationalism." The Journal of Social Issues, Vol. XXIII, No. 2 (April 1967), pp. 39-47.

_____. "Deutscher Sprachunterricht im Grundschulalter in den Vereinigten Staaten." Auslandskurier, Vol. VIII (August 1967), pp. 22-24.

_____. "Excerpts from the National Minority Law of the United States of America." Translated from the German by Ulrich Hans R. Mammitzsch. Honolulu, Hawaii: East-West Center, n.d. 72 pp. 123 bibliographical notes. (Occasional Papers of Research Translations, Institute of Advanced Projects.)

_____. The Bilingual Tradition in America. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House. In press. (Publications of the International Center for Research on Bilingualism.)

_____. Laws and Legal Documents Relating to Problems of Bilingual Education in the United States. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1717 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C., 20036. January 1971. 92 pp.

3. Andersson, Theodore. Foreign Languages in the Elementary School: A Struggle Against Mediocrity. Austin, Texas: The University of Texas Press, 1969, pp. 64-70.

4. Ellis, Frances H. "Historical Account of German Instruction in Public Schools of Indianapolis, 1869-1919." The Indiana Magazine of History, Vol. L, No. 2 (June 1954).

5. McGrath, Earl J. "Language Study and World Affairs." The Modern Language Journal, Vol. XXXVI, No. 5 (May 1952).

6. Parker, William Riley. The National Interest and Foreign Languages (A Discussion Guide and Work Paper prepared by William Riley Parker for the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, Department of State). Third edition. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961. (Department of State Publication 7324, International Organization and Conference Series 26.)

7. Gaarder, A. Bruce, and Mabel W. Richardson. "Two Patterns of Bilingual Education in Dade County, Florida." In Thomas E. Bird, ed., Foreign Language Learning: Research and Development: An Assessment. Reports of the Working Committees of the 1968 Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages. Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta Co., Inc., 1968, pp. 32-44.

8. Richardson, Mabel Wilson. "An Evaluation of Certain Aspects of the Academic Achievement of Elementary Pupils in a Bilingual Program: A Project." Coral Gables, Florida: The University of Miami, January 1968. Mimeographed. 72 pp. 43-item bibliography. Also published as a D.Ed. dissertation, same place and date.

9. Treviño, Bertha Alicia Gámez. "An Analysis of the Effectiveness of a Bilingual Program in the Teaching of Mathematics in Primary Grades." Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin, 1968. 116 pp. Bibliography, pp. 106-116.

10. United States Congress. Senate. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Committee Print, Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1967, With Background Materials and Tables. Prepared for the Subcommittee on Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, March 1968, p. 41.

11. Yarborough, Ralph W. United States Congress. Senate. Bilingual Education. Hearings Before the Special Subcommittee on Bilingual Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, Ninetieth Congress, First Session, on S. 428. Part I. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967, p. 1.

12. Texas Education Agency. Division of Research. "Report of Pupils in Texas Public Schools Having Spanish Surnames, 1955-1956." Austin, Texas: August 1957.

13. Browning, Harley L., and S. Dale McLemore. "The Spanish-Surname Population of Texas." Public Affairs Comment, The University of Texas, Austin, January 1964.

14. Leopold, Werner F. Speech Development of a Bilingual Child: A Linguist's Record. 4 vols. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1939-1949.

_____. Bibliography of Child Language. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1952. (Northwestern University Studies, Humanities Series, No. 28.)

_____. "A Child's Learning of Two Languages." Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University, School of Foreign Service, Institute of Language and Linguistics, September 1954. (Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics, No. 7, pp. 19-30.)

15. Haugen, Einar. "Language and Immigration." Norwegian-American Studies and Records, Vol. X (1938), pp. 1-43.

_____. "Problems of Bilingualism." Lingua (International Review of General Linguistics), Vol. II, No. 3 (August 1950), pp. 271-290.

_____. The Norwegian Language in America: A Study in Bilingual Behavior. 2 vols. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: The University of Pennsylvania Press, 1953. 695 pp. Bibliographical footnotes. (Publications of the American Institute, University of Oslo, in cooperation with the Department of American Civilization, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, University of Pennsylvania.)

_____. "Some Pleasures and Problems of Bilingual Research." International Journal of American Linguistics, Vol. XX, No. 2 (April 1954), pp. 116-122.

_____. "Problems of Bilingual Description." General Linguistics, Vol. I (1955), pp. 1-9.

_____. Bilingualism in the Americas: A Bibliography and Research Guide. Second printing. University of Alabama: The University of Alabama Press, 1964.
First printing: Gainesville, Florida: The American Dialect Society, November 1956. Publication No. 26. 160 pp.

_____. Language Conflict and Language Planning: The Case of Modern Norwegian. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1966. 393 pp. Bibliography (1. General and 2. Norwegian), pp. 325-353.

_____. The Norwegians in America: A Student's Guide to Localized History. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1967. 40 pp. (Localized History Series, Clifford L. Lord, editor.)

_____. "Bilingualism: Definition and Problems." Unpublished paper. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University, February 1968. 16 pp. 34 references.

_____. "Bilingualism, Language Contact, and Immigrant Languages in the United States: A Research Report, 1956-1970." In Thomas A. Sebeok, ed., Current Trends in Linguistics. The Hague: Mouton & Co., in press. 139 pp.

16. Covello, Leonard. The Social Background of the Italo-American School Child: A Study of the Southern Italian Family Mores and Their Effect on the School Situation in Italy and America. Edited and with an introduction and notes by Francesco Cordasco. Leiden, The Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1967. 488 pp. Bibliography, pp. xxv-xxx.

17. Manuel, Herschel T. Spanish-Speaking Children in the Southwest: Their Education and the Public Welfare. Austin, Texas: The University of Texas Press, 1965. 222 pp. References, pp. 209-215.

18. Carter, Thomas P. Mexican Americans in School: A Study of Educational Neglect. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1970.

19. Grebler, Leo, Joan W. Moore, and Ralph C. Guzmán, with Jeffrey L. Berlant, Thomas P. Carter, Walter Fogel, C. Wayne Gordon, Patrick H. McNamara, Frank G. Mittelbach, and Samuel J. Surace. The Mexican-American People: The Nation's Second Largest Minority. New York: The Free Press; London: Collier-Macmillan Ltd., 1970. 777 pp. Bibliography, pp. 677-742.

20. Weinreich, Uriel. Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems. With a preface by André Martinet. The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1967. 150 pp. 658-item bibliography.

21. Ervin-Tripp, Susan. "Semantic Shift in Bilingualism." American Journal of Psychology, Vol. LXXIV, No. 2 (June 1961), pp. 446-241.

_____. "Learning and Recall in Bilinguals." American Journal of Psychology, Vol. LXXIV, No. 3 (September 1961), pp. 446-451.

_____. "Language and TAT Content in Bilinguals." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Vol. LXVIII, No. 5 (May 1964), pp. 500-507. 17 references.

_____. "An Issei Learns English." The Journal of Social Issues, Vol. XXIII, No. 2 (April 1967), pp. 78-90.

_____. "Becoming a Bilingual." Working Paper No. 9, Language-Behavior Research Laboratory. University of California, Berkeley, March 1968. Mimeographed. 28 pp. (Funded by a grant from the Institute of International Studies, University of California, Berkeley.)

22. Hymes, Dell. Language in Culture and Society: A Reader in Linguistics and Anthropology. New York: Harper & Row, 1964. 764 pp. Bibliography, pp. 711-749.

_____. "Models on Interaction of Language and Social Setting." The Journal of Social Issues, Vol. XXIII, No. 2 (April 1967), pp. 8-28.

_____, and William E. Bittle, eds. Studies in Southwestern Ethnolinguistics: Meaning and History in Language of the American Southwest. The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1967. 467 pp. Bibliographies. (Studies in General Anthropology, No. 3.)

23. Modiano, Nancy. "National or Mother Tongue in Beginning Reading: A Comparative Study." Research in the Teaching of English, Vol. II, No. 1 (April 1968), pp. 32-43.

24. Gumperz, John. "On the Linguistic Markers of Bilingual Communication." The Journal of Social Issues, Vol. XXIII, No. 2 (April 1967), pp. 48-57.

25. Saville, Muriel R., and Rudolph C. Troike. A Handbook of Bilingual Education. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1717 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C., 20036. January 1970. 6r pp.

26. Yarborough, Ralph W. "Bilingual Education as a Social Force." Foreign Language Annals, Vol. II, No. 3 (March 1969), pp. 325-327.

_____. See also United States Congress. Senate. Bilingual Education. Hearings Before the Special Subcommittee on Bilingual Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States, Ninetieth Congress, First Session, on S. 428. Two parts. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

27. Southwest Council of Foreign Language Teachers (name changed in 1968 to Southwest Council for Bilingual Education). "A Resolution Concerning the Education of Bilingual Children," El Paso, Texas, November, 1965. (Newsletter No. 1, January 1966.)

_____. Reports: Our Bilinguals: Social and Psychological Barriers; Linguistic and Pedagogical Barriers. Edited by Chester Christian and Robert Lado. Second Annual Conference, El Paso, Texas, November 13, 1965.

_____. Reports: Bilingualism. Edited by Charles Stubing. Third Annual Conference, El Paso, Texas, November 4-5, 1966. 62 pp. Bibliographies.

_____. Reports: Bilingual Education: Research and Teaching. Edited by Chester Christian. Fourth Annual Conference, El Paso, Texas, November 10-11, 1967. 88 pp. Bibliographies.

Southwest Council for Bilingual Education. Bilingual Education in Three Cultures. Edited by Charles Olstad. Fifth Annual Conference, El Paso, Texas, November 1968.

_____. Bilingual Education: Commitment and Involvement. Edited by Charles Olstad. Sixth Annual Conference, Tucson, Arizona, November 1969.

_____. Reports: Bilingual Education: The Status of the Art, 1970. Edited by Charles Stubing. Seventh Annual Conference, El Paso, Texas, November 20-21, 1970.

28. National Education Association. Department of Rural Education. The Invisible Minority ... pero no vencibles. Report of the NEA-Tucson Survey on the Teaching of Spanish to the Spanish-Speaking. Joseph Stocker, editor. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1966. 39 pp.

_____. Las Voces Nuevas del Sudoeste. Third National NEA Conference on Civil and Human Rights in Education. Symposium: "The Spanish-Speaking Child in the Schools of the Southwest," Tucson, Arizona, October 30-31, 1966. Elinor Hart, editor. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1967.

29. Texas Education Agency. Division of Research. "Report of Pupils in Texas Public Schools Having Spanish Surnames, 1955-1956," Austin, Texas, August, 1957.

_____. Addresses and Reports Presented at the Conference on Development of Bilingualism in Children in Varying Linguistic and Cultural Heritages, January 31-February 3, 1967. W. R. Goodson, editor. Austin, Texas: Texas Education Agency, 1967. 123 pp. 220-item bibliography, pp. 111-123.

_____, et al. Improving Educational Opportunities of the Mexican-Americans. Proceedings of the First Texas Conference for the Mexican-American, April 13, 1967, San Antonio, Texas. Dwain M. Estes and David W. Darling, editors. Austin, Texas: Southwest Texas Educational Development Laboratory, Inter-American Education Center, Texas Education Agency, 1967.

30. Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. Bilingual Schooling in the United States. 2 vols. Theodore Andersson and Mildred Boyer, authors. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970. Bibliography, pp. 151-243.

31. Fishman, Joshua A. "Language Maintenance and Language Shift as a Field of Inquiry: A Definition of the Field and Suggestions for Its Further Development." Linguistics, An International Review, No. 9 (1964), pp. 32-70. 90-item bibliography.

_____, and Valdimir C. Nahirny. "The Ethnic Group School and Mother Tongue Maintenance in the United States." Sociology of Education, Vol. XVII, No. 4 (Summer 1964), pp. 306-317.

_____. "The Status and Prospects of Bilingualism in the United States." The Modern Language Journal, Vol. XLIX, No. 3 (March 1965), pp. 143-155.

_____. "Bilingualism, Intelligence, and Language Learning." The Modern Language Journal, Vol. XLIX, No. 4 (April 1965), pp. 227-236.

_____. "Yiddish in America: Socio-Linguistic Description and Analysis." International Journal of American Linguistics, Vol. XXXI, No. 2, Part 2 (April 1965). 94 pp. Bibliography, pp. 87-94. (Publication of the Indiana University Research Center in Anthropology, Folklore, and Linguistics, No. 36.)

_____. "Who Speaks What Language to Whom and When?" La Linguistique, Vol. II (1965), pp. 67-88. 29 references.

_____. Hungarian Language Maintenance in the United States. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1966. 58 pp. Bibliography, pp. 54-58. (The Uralic and Altaic Series, Vol. LXII.)

_____, et al. Language Loyalty in the United States: The Maintenance and Perpetuation of Non-English Mother Tongues by American Ethnic and Religious Groups. With an introduction by Einar Haugen. The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1966. 478 pp. Bibliographies.

_____. "Bilingualism With and Without Diglossia; Diglossia With and Without Bilingualism." The Journal of Social Issues, Vol. XXIII, No. 2 (April 1967), pp. 29-38.

_____. "Sociolinguistic Perspective on the Study of Bilingualism." Linguistics, An International Review, No. 39 (May 1968), pp. 21-49. 51-item bibliography.

_____, ed. Readings in the Sociology of Language. The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1968. 808 pp. Bibliographies.

_____, et al. Bilingualism in the Barrio. 2 vols. Final Report, Contract No. OEC-1,062817-0297. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Office of Education; Bureau of Research, 1968. 1,209 pp. References.

_____. "Bilingualism in the Barrio." The Modern Language Journal, Vol. LIII, No. 3 (March 1969). Special issue on bilingualism, with a preface by Joshua A. Fishman.

_____, and Heriberto Casiano. "Puerto Ricans in Our Press." The Modern Language Journal, Vol. LIII, No. 3 (March 1969), pp. 157-162.

_____, and John Lovas. "Bilingual Education in Sociolinguistic Perspective." TESOL Quarterly, Vol. IV, No. 3 (September 1970), pp. 215-222.

32. Gaarder, A. Bruce. "Teaching the Bilingual Child: Research, Development, and Policy." The Modern Language Journal, Vol. XLIX, No. 3 (March 1965), pp. 165-175.

_____. "Conserving Our Linguistic Resources." PMLA, Vol. LXXX, No. 2B (May 1965), pp. 19-23.

_____. "The Challenge of Bilingualism." In G. Reginald Bishop, ed. Foreign Language Teaching: Challenges to the Profession. Reports of the Working Committees of the Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, 1965, pp. 54-101. 9 references.

_____. "Organization of the Bilingual School." The Journal of Social Issues, Vol. XXIII, No. 2 (April 1967), pp. 110-120. 13 references.

_____, and Mabel W. Richardson. "Two Patterns of Bilingual Education in Dade County, Florida. In Thomas E. Bird, ed., Foreign Language Learning: Research and Development: An Assessment.

_____. "Bilingualism." In Donald D. Walsh, ed. A Handbook for Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese. Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath and Company, a Division of Raytheon Education Company, 1969, pp. 149-172. Bibliography, pp. 170-172.

_____. "Bilingual-Bicultural Education and Cultural Pluralism: The Special Case of the Mexican Americans." A paper presented to the World Jewish Congress, London, December 1970. Mimeographed. 48 pp.

33. The Bilingual Education Act of 1968, enacted as Public Law 90-247, is also known as Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, in which it was incorporated. It was amended on April 13, 1970 (Public Law 91-230). As amended, it comprises four pages of the Compilation of Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Legislation, printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor, Carl D. Perkins, Chairman, House of Representatives, Ninety-first Congress, Second Session, November 1970, by the U.S. Government Printing Office. (No. 51-877.)

34. The Draft Manual dated March 20, 1970, runs to 191 pages. (U.S. Government Printing Office, No. 0-398-198.)

35. One of these was Leon Lessinger, who, after leaving the Office of Education, published a book on the subject entitled Every Kid a Winner (New York: Simon & Schuster, Inc., 1970.)

36. John, Vera P., and Vivian Horner, et al. A Handbook on Early Childhood Bilingual Education. New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1971. In press.

37. "The First Seventy-Six Bilingual Education Projects." In James E. Alatis, editor, 21st Annual Round Table: Bilingualism and Language Contact: Anthropological, Linguistic, Psychological, and Sociological Aspects. Georgetown University, School of Languages and Linguistics, November 23, 1970, pp. 163-178. (Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics.)

38. Kjolseth, Rolf. "Bilingual Education Programs in the United States: For Assimilation or Pluralism?" A paper presented in the section of Sociological Perspectives on Bilingual Education of the Sociolinguistics Program of the Seventh World Congress of Sociology, held in Varna, Bulgaria, September 14-19, 1970. To be published in the Transactions.

39. Fishman, Joshua A., and John Lovas. "Bilingual Education in Sociolinguistic Perspective." TESOL Quarterly, Vol. IV, No. 3 (September 1970), p. 215.

40. Mackey, William F. "A Typology of Bilingual Education." In Andersson and Boyer, Bilingual Schooling in the United States, Vol. II, Appendix E, pp. 63-82. Also published in Foreign Language Annals, Vol. III, No. 4 (May 1970), pp. 596-608.